

8696

# REMARKS

ON PART II. of

Dr. *WARREN*'s

# ANSWER

To a Book, Entitled,

A PLAIN ACCOUNT of the *Nature*  
and *End* of the *Sacrament* of the  
*Lord's Supper.*

---

By *PHILAEETHES SUFFOLCIENSIS.*

---



L O N D O N:

Printed for J. ROBERTS, near the *Oxford-*  
*Arms* in *Warwick-Lane.* MDCCXXXVI.

REMARKS

ON

THE

WARR



AND

THE

WARR

AND

THE

WARR

AND

THE

WARR

AND

THE

WARR

AND

THE

WARR

AND

THE

WARR

AND

THE

WARR

AND

THE

WARR



# REMARKS

On PART II. of

Dr. *Warren's* Answer, &c.

**T**HE Discovery of Truth, with the good Effect it ought to have both on his own Mind and that of others, is the only proper End that a Controversist in Religion can have before him.

Whilst he has this point in view, and sedulously pursues it, he thinks at least like a Christian, whether he reasons like a Man or no. But if instead of this, he endeavours to hide or obscure Truth, or without scruple advances Falshoods to maintain his own prejudiced or mistaken Notions; tho' every Man will bear him witness that he has a *Zeal*, yet no wise or good Man will say, it is *according to Knowledge*: And much less will they think it defensible, if he continues to go on in the same Track.

How far this comports with the Conduct of Dr. *Warren* in his *First Part*, my Remarks thereupon but too evidently shew;

A 2

and

and probably, had I not accidentally open'd upon the second Page of his *Second*, where he falls upon the Author of the *Plain Account* with a manifest *Untruth*, I had not been led into this Reflection. " 'Tis *very odd and singular*, (he *there* says) in the *Author*, to direct all his Arguments against a *real Sacrifice* and *Altar* to the *Romanists* only, " whereas there are *other Christians*, who " maintain the *same* things on a quite different foot." Which is so far from being the State of the Case, that the *Author* in the very place cited by the *Doctor*, does not only take notice, that *other Christians* hold the *same* things, but that they do it more *absurdly* and *inconsistently* than the *Romanists* themselves. " These, *says he*, are self-consistent, " and all of a piece : But as for *Those* who " have disavowed the Absurdity (of offering " up the *very Body* and *Blood* of *Christ* in " the *Sacrament*) still to be fond of the Notion of an *Altar*, when they have parted " with *That*, which alone could be the " Ground of it, is very hardly to be accounted for \*." Here he plainly *directs* his *Argument* more strongly against *Those other Christians*, than he does against the *Romanists*; and yet the good *Doctor* says, He does not direct it against *Them* at all. Upon what Principle he can pretend to justify such a Treatment of a very Great and Good Man, I know

\* Pag. 57. of the *Plain Account*.



know not ; But I do assure him in my Judgment it does, and I think in the Judgment of all impartial Persons it must, appear, not only *very odd and singular*, but also, *very ungenerous and unjust*.

This only by the bye, as to the *Morality* of the Performance, which shews itself in many such like Instances ; but as to the *Consistency* of it, and His great *Sagacity* in penetrating into the *Author's* Sense, and illustrating his *Own*, they may be worth the while of a little farther Disquisition : Even tho' I had before determined, not so much as to read his Pamphlet \*

To this purpose, see the Beginning that he makes ! “ I concluded, *says he*, the *First Part* “ of my *Answer*, with a *Paraphrase* on the “ famous Passage in the xth Chapter of the “ 1st to the *Corinthians* ; ” (*viz.* concerning the *Communion* of the *Body and Blood of Christ*) “ and with a State of the Argument for the “ Participation of *Spiritual Benefits* in the “ Lord's Supper, *founded* upon the same †.” Now any one, who has not observed the Confusedness of his Thoughts, and how indistinct his Ideas for the most part are, would be apt to believe this to be *literally* and *severely* true ; and, that his former Arguings had *really* been for a Participation of *mere* spiritual Benefits in the *Lord's Supper*, and that the Author of the *Plain Account* (whom he *pretends* to answer) had

\* Pag. 28. of my former Remarks.

† Pag. 1.

had actually denied there were any *such* partaken of in it. But to understand the Merits of this Cause the better, hear them both in their own Language.

The *Author*, in pag. 155 of his Book, expresses himself in this manner. " We shall  
 " find, that by our partaking of the Lord's  
 " Supper according to the *Nature* and *De-*  
 " *sign* of it, we not only profess ourselves  
 " *Christ's* Disciples, and acknowledge our  
 " *Obligation* to live according to his Laws ;  
 " but that we are led by it to a *serious* Consi-  
 " deration of the Tenor and Design of his  
 " Holy Religion, and to the *sincerest* Thank-  
 " fulness for all that he *did* and *suffered* for  
 " us, as well as to the most *proper* Dispositi-  
 " ons and Resolutions of behaving ourselves  
 " as becomes us, in our Relation to Him as  
 " our *Head*, and to our Brethren as *Fellow-*  
 " *members* with us of the same Body. — So  
 " that our Attendance upon this *Rite*, is not  
 " only the paying a Religious Service in the  
 " way appointed by *Christ*, which cannot but  
 " be always acceptable to God ; but it is a  
 " doing *That*, which we ourselves can see to  
 " tend naturally to *revive* and *keep alive* in  
 " our Minds all such Thoughts, Dispositions  
 " and Tendencies, as are proper to *work up-*  
 " on the Conduct of our Lives. And what  
 " *reasonable* Creature, who believes his Salva-  
 " tion thro' *Christ* depends on his *own* holy  
 " and good Practice, would not be content  
 " with

“ with Benefits of this sort.” That is, with such as serious *Considerations*, sincere *Thankfulness*, holy *Resolutions*, a lively *Faith*, and a true *Love* to *Christ*, and to our *Brethren*; which are all *pure* and *spiritual*, and but different Parts of *that Grace*, which is *worked* in all well-disposed Christians by this Holy Ordinance, as a *Means* of it? Certainly no reasonable Man can *desire* more; nor has any Man of Sense Ground to *expect* more, from That, which at most is but acknowledg’d by our Church, if not by all *protestant Churches* upon Earth, to be a *Means of Grace*, and a *Pledge to assure us thereof*. But Dr. Warren, who has imaginary Reasons of his own for not being satisfied with any thing *common*, of which every one may partake in an intelligible and conceivable manner, has argued heretofore, as if it was a *Means* of actually *conveying* to, and *conferring* on, us something *extraordinary* \*, which no reasonable Man can either understand or believe.

Here indeed he talks of *spiritual Benefits*, and merely such, as partaken of in the *Lord’s Supper*, according to the State of *His Argument*; but if this be true, he has been only beating the Air, or fighting with a Goblin of his own Brain, which is not very much for his Reputation as a Polemical Writer: For in this, who opposes him? Or who has advanced one Syllable to the contrary? Not the  
 Author

\* Pag. 5. *& passim*, of his *First Part*.

Author of the *Plain Account*; who maintains the same thing in Contra-distinction to *all other* Notions, and (as above) has put the Truth of it in so clear a Light, that any thing but a *Bat* or a *Mole* may easily perceive it. But that the *Doctor* by *spiritual Benefits* in this place does not mean spiritual Benefits *properly* so called, see his boasted *Paraphrase* to which he refers us; and there perhaps we shall be able to unravel the Clue of his pretended Meaning, which he seems not rightly to understand himself. It is in *Pag. 77.* of his *first Part*, and as much as concerns the present Debate is this: "By a joint partaking of the Body  
 " and Blood of *Christ* in the Sacrament, you  
 " profess your Subjection to him, and hold  
 " Communion with him, whereby you are  
 " made Partakers of the Benefits of his *Passion*." Now let me ask any Man of plain natural Sense, whether the Benefits of *Christ's Passion* be the *spiritual* Benefits of the *Lord's Supper*; except the *Supper* be the *Passion* itself, or the one appointed by God, and the other by *Christ*, for one and the same Purpose? And yet there are no *other* Benefits but *These*, mention'd throughout his *Paraphrase*: And consequently he does not understand his own Meaning, or he insincerely represents it, when he says, "The *State* of his *Argument* for a Participation of *spiritual* Benefits in the *Lord's Supper*, is founded on that Passage of *St. Paul* to the *Corinthians*, concerning the Cup of Blessing



*sing which we bless."* But truly he so often, and so generally, confounds and jumbles together the Benefits of *Christ's Passion*, and the Benefits of *his Supper*, that it may be justly called, (as indeed I have all along taken it to be) the reigning Blunder of his Performance; which, at first having crept into his Head *implicitly* and *without Examination*, has drawn him unawares into a Labyrinth of Controversy, out of which let him get again if he can, with any Credit to himself.

'Tis as clear to me as a mathematical Axiom, That as the *Lord's Supper* is a Means of *Grace*, and *Christ's Death* a Means of *Salvation*; so *Grace* work'd in us is the Benefits of the one, and *Salvation* conferred on us the Benefits of the other: Which are things as different in their Nature and Meaning, as the Earth is from the Heavens, or, as our honest Endeavours are here from our Reward hereafter. If the *Doctor* then begins his Pamphlet, with mistaking such an obvious Truth; what can we promise ourselves but Inconsistency upon Inconsistency, if we dive deeper into him? If he does not know what he means himself, but substitutes one thing for another, and throws his own Ideas, like Rubbish, upon Heaps, with Disorder and Confusion; can it be thought he is really capable of perceiving and unfolding the plain Sense of the *Author* he has taken upon him to answer and confute? To be sure, it cannot. But for

an Instance of this, consider the *Author's* Words, *Pag. 59.* of the *Plain Account*, who says, that in receiving the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, " We *acknowledge* ourselves " Members of that Body of which *Christ* is " the Head, and are thereby *obliged* to *all* the " Duties, and *entitled* (unless we are wanting to ourselves in some *necessary* Point) to " *all* the Blessings of *such* a Relation." Here the *Author* affirms we are *entitled* to, or, in other Words, *made as sure* as Christians can be in this World of, *all the Blessings* of our Profession, upon honestly discharging *all the Duties* belonging to it: But see the *Doctor's* Comment hereupon, and with what Sagacity he comprehends the Sense! " The Amount, " *says he*, of all this is no more, than that " the Participation of the Sacrament is a Token of our believing *Christ* to be our Master. It is *no Pledge* or *Security* of any Benefits to be received by our Fellowship with him, and our Dependence on him \*." This, I cannot but say, is of a Piece with his *First Part*, in which he boldly and against the express Declarations of the *Author* maintains, " That the *Author's main Intention* is, to prove, that there is *no Sacrament at all* in the Lord's Supper, or that 'tis *no Means* of Grace, nor *any Pledge* to assure us thereof ;" which has been sufficiently refuted in my *former Remarks*. But was ever any *plain Truth*, either

\* Pag. 6.

ther so misunderstood, or so unjustly represented, as this before us? For, Do we not hold *Communion* with *Christ*, by acknowledging Him our *Head*, and Us his *Members*? And by doing our *Duties*, are we not entitled to all the Blessings of *such* a Relation? And is not then the *Sacrament* in which we acknowledge this, a *Pledge* or an *Assurance*, even in the plain Meaning of the *Author*, of our receiving those *Blessings*, which may be also call'd its *Benefits*? Not indeed, if we merely partake of the *Bread* and *Wine*, without any other Qualification; but if we do the *Duties* we are obliged to, it is such an *Assurance*. Can Words be plainer, or Sense more clear, to a Man that thinks? But if Our *Answerer* will not think, the Defect is not in the *Author's* Sense, his Learning, or Integrity, but in his own Carelessness of Attention, or his Incapacity to attend.

However, to do him Justice, there is nothing surprizing in this. Things odd and uncommon are apt to startle us: But the *Doctor* is, as I once said before, generally self-consistent. For the Confirmation of which, I appeal to that *True Purport* and *True Doctrine* of the Institution of the *Lord's Supper*, and of the *Passage* of *St. Paul* aforementioned, which he now undertakes to give us; in Opposition to the *Paraphrase* and *Comment* thereupon, of the *Author* of the *Plain Account*: But which, (indeed) by being opposed to *Him*, is at the

same time opposed, both to Plain Sense and Divine Truth. "The Lord's Supper, *says he,*  
 "is an Ordinance appointed by Christ himself  
 "as a Means of Worship, and of obtaining  
 "God's Favour; particularly, the Bread and  
 "Wine, being, by a solemn Invocation of the  
 "Divine Blessing upon them, made the Body  
 "and Blood of Christ, in the Sense of repre-  
 "senting the same, do become the Means of  
 "conveying to the worthy Receivers thereof,  
 "the Benefits of Christ's Passion, whereby the  
 "Pardon of Sin, the Assistance of the Blessed  
 "Spirit, and Eternal Life, are confirmed  
 "and insured to them \*." This, and indeed  
 more than this to the like purpose, the Learn-  
 ed Doctor would willingly (to use his own  
 Expression) *paln upon us for Truth*†: I hope,  
 because he himself *knows no better*, rather  
 than because he thinks us ignorant and cre-  
 dulous enough *to believe him*. Had our Blef-  
 sed Saviour, or Saint Paul, reasoned in this  
 absurd and incoherent manner about the *Insti-*  
*tution*, the one had made no Disciples in that  
 respect, nor the other any Converts, to this  
 Day. How *He* may succeed with Men of  
 Weak Judgments, who take Noise for Rea-  
 son, and much Assurance for good Argument,  
 I cannot say; but I defy him to get any one  
 Man of sound Sense, or true Christian Princi-  
 ples, to joyn with him in saying: "The  
 Lord's Supper is appointed *for a Means of*  
*Worship*

\* Pag. 10.

† Pag. 63.



*Worship, or (properly) for obtaining the Divine Favour."* Who knows not, that the Lord's Supper is an *Act of Worship*, and a *Means of Grace*? It is a paying to God and Christ a Religious Service, and thereby becomes the *Means* of conveying Grace to the Souls of Men who endeavour after it; and if they do concur with *that Grace* in living *honestly* and *sincerely* a good Life for the future, they do *thereby* obtain the *Divine Favour*, but not merely by *receiving* the Sacrament, tho' they come to it as *worthily* prepared as they possibly can.

The next thing herein observable is, That after he has described the *Consecration* in an almost unintelligible manner, he according to his *old way* maintains, the consecrated Elements of *Bread* and *Wine* to be the Means of conveying, to the worthy Receivers, the *Benefits of Christ's Passion*. This is so far from being *true*, that it has been already shewn in my Remarks on his *first Part*, to be *impossible* to be so; \* and that, from his own Way of Reasoning in his most *applauded* and most *admired* Argument. But here I shall let him into a Secret, which probably he never thought of; which is, That our Lord himself has told us expressly, by *what Means* the Benefits of *his Death* are convey'd; and as ill Luck will have it, it is not by the Sacrament of the *Lord's Supper*. That, *Salvation* or *eternal Life*,

*Life*, including the *Pardon of Sin*, are the Benefits of *Christ's Death*, has been before argued, and proved (except a Man will put out his Eyes, and stand resolute against Conviction) beyond a Possibility of gainsaying it †; and our Blessed Saviour has assured us, That *all Power is given to him by the Father over all Flesh, that he may give eternal Life to as many as believe in him.* || The Oeconomy therefore of this Divine Goodness is this: The *Sacraments* are the Means of *Grace*, appointed by our Saviour, for the better fitting and preparing us for partaking hereafter of the Benefits of his Death; but the Means appointed by God for the *conveying* unto, or *conferring* upon us, *these* Benefits, is our *Lord* himself, when he shall sit in Judgment over the Sons of Men. And indeed to suppose them *given* or *conveyed* by any other *inferior* or *prior* Means, is to preclude *Christ* in the Execution of that most awful and tremendous Office. In short, it contradicts the Bible, and subverts a main Branch of our Holy Faith.

Finally, I cannot but remark, that the *Doctor* in this place ranks the *Assistance* of the *Holy Spirit* of God with the Benefits of *Christ's Passion*, as *one* of them; but for what Reason, or by what Authority, I know not: Nor do I remember any one Part of Holy Writ, that teaches this Doctrine; but many, very many, that imply the contrary. For,  
Was

† Pag. 9. of *these* Remarks. || *John* xvii. 2.

Was no body assisted by the Spirit of G O D, before our Lord *laid down his Life* for us? Were the *Saints* of old any more good *without* Grace, than we are now? Did they not pray for *that* Divine Influence, and obtain it also? Is there not a thousand Instances of this in the *Old Testament*? What are the *Psalms*, but a Volume full of Petitions and Acknowledgments of this Kind? But to come nearer still: Did not our Lord himself, in the first Year of his *Ministry*, teach his Disciples *how to pray*? \* And is there in *his Prayer*, no Petition for Divine Grace? And did not he also in his Lifetime assure his Disciples, that *his heavenly Father would*, even then, *give his Holy Spirit to them that asked him*? † Let him consider this with himself; and then let him tell me if he can, whether the *Assistance* of the *Holy Spirit* is to be reckoned a *Benefit* of the *Passion of Christ*? And much more, whether this be any Part of the *true Purport and Doctrine of the Institution of the Lord's Supper*, or, of the *celebrated Passage of St. Paul*? Had the Author of the *Plain Account* been so unobserving of Truth, or so incorrect in Expression, as to have given us *such* a Paraphrase or *such* a Comment, he would justly have drawn upon him the Contempt and Derision of all Learned Men; but as it is now, I fear Dr. *Warren* must bear it himself, and for nothing more, than for not having studied his  
 Author

\* Matth. vi. 9.

† Luke xi. 13.

Author better before he undertook to answer him: who would have taught him, "That  
 " to say, *this* Sacrament is designed or or-  
 " dained peculiarly for obtaining GOD's Ho-  
 " ly Spirit, is to forget and contradict those  
 " exprefs Words of our Saviour, in which he  
 " himself has annexed *that Benefit* (whatever  
 " the Nature and Degree of it be) to the Du-  
 " ty of *Prayer* only." But for want of this,  
 see how miserably he has betrayed his Learn-  
 ing and his Judgment!

The Author of the *Plain Account* in para-  
 phrasing the Discourse of St. Paul to the Co-  
 rinthians, relating to their Mis-use of the Sa-  
 crament of the *Lord's Supper*, it seems has  
 advanced or implied, "That they who beha-  
 ved themselves *unworthily* at the Celebra-  
 tion, were *ignorant* of the Nature and End of  
 that Duty: That their Irreverence, however,  
 was chiefly occasioned by an Excess of *intem-  
 perate* drinking in their *Love-Feasts*, which  
 usually preceded the *Holy Supper*: That Sick-  
 ness and Death were come upon them as  
*Judgments*, on that account: And, that there-  
 fore for the future, they ought to examine  
 themselves, that they might receive the Sacra-  
 ment *so*, that is, *in such a manner*, as became  
 the Institution of it." Now one would be  
 apt to think this very easy and plain, and no  
 more than a natural Chain of thinking from  
 the Purport of the *Epistle* itself: But Dr. War-  
 ren having more refined and superior Senti-  
 ments,



ments, is not a little elate with the Advantage he thinks the *Author* has here given him ; and indeed exerts himself upon it, in more than ordinary Strains of Heroism and Bravery. “ Tho’ you, *says he*, have *disguised* the “ true Design of the *Apostle* in this Passage, I “ shall by degrees *clear* it up, and *shew*, not “ only that it does not serve your Hypothe- “ sis, but that it plainly and necessarily de- “ stroys it \*.” And within a Page or two he adds farther, “ With how much Assurance “ soever you may give this for the *Apostle’s* “ Sense ; I think, if all the *Errors* in it of “ every kind were number’d, they would not “ fall *much short* of the Sentences them- “ selves †.” Where ’tis worth observing, That before he comes to shew the *Author’s* Artifice in *disguising* the Truth, he prudently goes on to prove, that he has *no Artifice* at all in him ; but shoots quite wide of the Mark, and mistakes in every thing.

As to the *Corinthians* being at all *ignorant*, he flatly denies the Fact ; and, such as they are, gives his Reasons for it. “ For is it pos- “ sible, *says he*, that they with whom the *A- “ postle* lived, and to whom he had preached “ the Gospel, for near *two Years* together, “ should, even *any* among them, be destitute “ of such a Knowledge, as that of the Na- “ ture and End of the *Lord’s Supper* || ?” On the other hand, “ The *Apostle’s* own Words “ and

C

\* Pag. 13.

† Pag. 16.

|| Pag. 17.

“ and exprefs Declarations are againſt it, who  
 “ ſays in the 2d *Verſe* of this Chapter, Now  
 “ *I praiſe you, brethren, that you remember me*  
 “ *in all things, and keep the ordinances as I de-*  
 “ *liver’d them unto you \**.” Of which Num-  
 ber, he concludes the Sacrament of the *Lord’s*  
*Supper* was one.

Now I cannot but remark hereupon, that  
 notwithstanding theſe *impoſſible* things which  
 he ſets before us, there is one very ſtrong Pre-  
 ſumption, that it was *poſſible*, there might be  
 at leaſt ſome among the *Corinthians* that were  
 really ignorant of the Nature and true Deſign  
 of the *Lord’s Supper*; becauſe there cannot o-  
 therwiſe be any good Reason given, why the  
*Apoſtle* ſhould inſtruct *Them* in it particularly,  
 more than *other Churches*. For as all the Sa-  
 cred *Epistles* were wrote *occasionally*, ſo had it  
 not been for ſome Defect relating to *this* Sa-  
 crament, the Apoſtle certainly had not men-  
 tioned it in writing to *them*: As we had never  
 heard of *delivering* an Inceſtuous Perſon *over*  
*unto Satan*, but that there was *ſuch* a Perſon.  
 And this may ſerve to light the Doctor to the  
*Author’s* Meaning, and the Juſtneſs of it,  
 when he ſays, “ We had never heard of *eating*  
 and *drinking unworthily*, but upon *their* Ac-  
 count;” and againſt which he has made ſuch  
 a Clamour, *pag. 65.* as if it vacated the Deſign  
 of GOD in giving us this *Epistle*: For was  
 GOD’s Deſign the leſs, becauſe it was wrote  
*occasio-*

*occasionally*? If so, it was *His* Design that none of them should be written. Which is such an Absurdity, as the least Degree of Sense will not allow of.

Besides, 'tis very *probable*, tho' *Some* were *Wise* among them, as *being enrich'd by God in all Utterance and all Knowledge*\*, meaning their Teachers chiefly; yet *All* the People were *not* so: For in those Days there were Converts daily coming over from Heathenism to Christianity; and as these had been usually *intemperate* at their Idolatrous Feasts, they may very reasonably be supposed to have retained too great a Relish for their *former* Indecencies, and not to have had a *perfect* Notion of the *Supper* of the Lord. But to corroborate this Conjecture, give me leave to interrogate the *Doctor* himself, Whether in *his* Parish, where he found the People all *ready made* Christians, there be none of them who come to the *Holy Communion*, who continue *still ignorant* of the Nature and true Design of it; tho' we'll suppose he has been instructing them with his utmost Care for near *twenty Years* together? Yes: I dare say, the greatest part of them; except they are better learned upon the Subject, and know more, than their Instructor himself, *seems* to do; who strangely imagines it (contrary to all Sense, Reason, and Divinity) to be, not so much *for the continual Remembrance of the Sacrifice*,

\* 1 Cor. i. 5.

as for a certain Conveyance of the Benefits, of the Death of *Christ*; and that too, contrary to the express Doctrine of our own Church, who herself calls it no more than a *Means of Grace*.

Again, I'm afraid, he is somewhat mistaken, in thinking the *Lord's Supper* to be one of the *Ordinances*, for the *keeping* or retaining of which the *Corinthians* were so highly commended, by the *Apostle*. For the *Ordinances* there mentioned, were certainly no other than traditionary *Rules* of Decency and Order, which he had *prudentially* given them; and their Observance of which he looks upon, rather as a *Compliment* paid to his own Judgment and Advice, than as an *Act* of Religion to *GOD*. Otherwise 'tis likely he would have said, *I praise you, Brethren, that you obey or serve GOD in all things, even in observing the Ordinances or Rules, which I gave unto you*; but instead of this he says, *I praise you, that you remember Me, that is, have such a Regard or Respect for me, in all things, as you shew you have, by keeping my Traditions*. And having mentioned this, he goes on to give them more Rules of the same kind, such as, that the Women ought to pray *cover'd*, and the Men *uncover'd*, the Men to wear *short* Hair, and the Women *long*. This is so plainly and undeniably the Case, that I wonder how any Man of the least Attention could mistake it. But 'tis plain,



plain, when a certain sort of Men have got Ends to serve, they must be served by one way or other \* : Otherwise the very Words of the *Apostle* would have led him to his most natural and easy Sense; and shewn him, that he did not commend them for *duly observing* the Ordinance of the *Lord's Supper*. For, he says, *what shall I say to you? Shall I praise you in This? I praise you not.* That is, I commended you *before* for other things; but *now* I blame you: And the very Learned Dr. *Wells* observes in his Paraphrase hereupon, "That he spoke this *with reference* to this Holy Rite, forasmuch as they *had not kept* what he *had deliver'd* unto them." Nay, to urge This Truth, as well as to reprove Their Abuse of the Sacrament, the more strongly, St. *Paul* adds; *For I received of the LORD,* (that is, I did not speak it of my own Judgment or mere Discretion, as I did the others) *that which I also delivered unto you: That the Lord Jesus, in the Night he was betrayed, took Bread, &c.* And then repeating the whole Institution, that they might better observe it for the future, he concludes upon it thus: *Wherefore, whosoever shall eat this Bread and drink this Cup of the LORD unworthily, shall be Guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord.* Shall we now, after so clear a Proof of the *Corinthians* not keeping up to the Institution of the *Lord's Supper*, conclude against

\* See Pag. 12. of my former Remarks. . . .

against the Author of the *Plain Account*, That they were very *observant* of it, only because Dr. *Warren* says so; who has brought no better Argument for it than this, That 'tis said they *kept the Ordinances*, and the Word [*την εναντιον*] Ordinance is derived from [*την εναντιον*] delivered, which St. Paul chanced to make use of in treating thereof \*? Suppose the Apostle had said, *For I received of the LORD, that which I also preached unto you*: His Sense had certainly been as good, and his Argument no less convincing; but then how greatly would the Church have suffered, for want of *such a Critic*.

As to their behaving themselves *disorderly* at the Lord's Table through Intemperance, he pretends to take off that Charge from the *Corinthians* by a Criticism upon the Greek word [*μεθυσεν*] which signifies *to be drunken*; "but which he will have used *sometimes*, and therefore *now* also, in a more favourable Sense, and to imply no more than to be *cheerful* with Wine, or *merry* with good Liquor, and that consequently there was nothing *criminal* in the Case before us †." Now to what this tends, I must own, I cannot discover; except it be, that he may have got some Friends that love their Bottle, and he is willing to indulge them a more libertine manner, than is consistent with the *usual Severity* of coming to this Holy Ordinance. But be that as it will,

will, this certainly draws after it a far worse Consequence, than any thing can be fasten'd on the Doctrine of the *Plain Account*. That at most says no more, than that a long formal Preparation is not essentially necessary, so that a Man's *Frame of Mind* and *external Behaviour* be *suitable* to the Nature and End of the Institution, when he is *there*; but *This* teaches, that going to the Lord's Table [*μετὰ τὸν κύβητον*] *well-fill'd* with Wine, or gay and merry as they may be supposed to have been at the Marriage in *Cana in Galilee*, (which is one of the Instances he makes use of) is not at all *criminal*, nor consequently an *improper* or *unworthy* Preparation. Thus the good *Doctor* may talk privately, among his Friends; but let him not think to put this Stuff upon the World, for a Christian Doctrine: For 'tis certain he argues here, not only against the Author of the *Plain Account*, but against *St. Paul* himself, and against the united Judgment of all the *best* Commentators, who allow the *Translation* as it now stands, and interpret this Passage to a *criminal Sense*. And indeed without supposing it, the Word [*μετὰ τὸν κύβητον*] in this place has no proper Meaning; because it is actually opposed to [*πρὸς τὸν κύβητον*] the Word in the next following *Vers*, which there signifies *drinking* to the satisfying the Appetite in a moderate, harmless, inoffensive Sort. He must therefore permit me to throw back his own Words upon him, and say, "That since  
" he

“ he has presumed to *reason* in such an *arbitrary* manner, even against the plain Words before him, and all the just Rules of Interpretation ; it is evident, all he has built upon it can be of no Service to himself \*,” nor of any Weight with Persons of good Literature, or so much as a tolerable Understanding.

Besides this, he has more of the same *Gout* : But as I write not an *Answer* to his Work, but only *Remarks* upon it, I think this sufficient for a Specimen of his great Abilities, as a Critical Writer. And I am confident, the Reader will as gladly as myself excuse the rest ; especially when I let him know, that he has judiciously thrown away no less than *nine Pages* upon one poor Monosyllable of *two Letters* only, which yet he owns, “ the Author of the *Plain Account* has dealt *fairly* by his Readers, in leaving as a thing *indifferent* to his Subject, though he thought it might be applied *more suitably* to the Text than it commonly is.†” But, if any Man be not content with this ; let him read the *Criticism* itself, which (he may take my word for it) is a curious Piece, well worth his Labour, and full of useful and instructive Erudition.

This is the Way Dr. *Warren* has taken to evince, that the *Author's* Paraphrase has as many *Errors* as *Sentences* ; and, that he himself is a Man of much sounder Learning, and

\* Pag. 25.

† Pag. 38.



and a more penetrating Genius. But, O dreadful and ill-boding! now he changes to a Scene of Horror, and discovers such a Piece of *dishonest Artifice*, as none but the *Author* could be guilty of: And indeed such it is, that I would not for the world have it mentioned, but between you and myself. It is, "That he has *dextrously removed* from the Reader's View several Verses in his Paraphrase upon St. Paul's Account relating to the *Institution* and *worthy Partaking* of the Lord's Supper, and to the *Corinthians Abuse* of it.\*" In a word, when the *Author* intended to paraphrase no more than what *was* to his purpose, he did not paraphrase that which *was not* to his purpose, or rather what he *thought* so: And this the *Doctor*, (because the *Author* does not *think* just as *He* does; for who can equal him?) in his usual Style of Civility and Politeness, calls, "a Management with an odd Aspect, a Proceeding *suspectable of Fraud*, and in short, an *Artifice not to be justified*."† But why all this Clamour and warm Accusation? Why does he act so far out of Character, and quite beyond the Rules of Decorum, against a Person, who (he has the greatest Reason to believe) is on all Accounts far superior to himself? But for good Literature, a clear Head, and Perspicuity of Style, not to mention the Smoothness of his Periods, and the Calmness of his Reasoning, the whole Learned

D

\* Pag. 39.

† Pag. 41.

ed World will join in saying, There is no Comparison.

It seems the Verses *removed out of View*, as the *Doctor* complains, though the *Author* never finger'd one of them, [he means, *Not brought into View*] stand higher in the *Epistle*, than where the *Author* began, and relate to the Divisions which the *Corinthians* had one with another in their *Love-Feasts*; and the *Doctor* pretends to shew, "That these Divisions were *expressly* and *clearly* the Cause," that is, the *only* Cause, "of their Unworthiness for partaking of the Lord's Supper.\*" (Where I cannot but remark, that *any* Unworthiness in *Them* is not very consistent with that *strict Observance* of the *Institution*, which he said the *Apostle* commended them for.) And whereas the *Author* says, "The *Examination* mentioned by *St. Paul* as regarding the Lord's Supper is, strictly speaking, a Christian's *Examination* of his own Heart and Disposition, by the *Institution* of this Holy Rite, in order to assure himself, that he comes *to it*, and will behave himself *at it*, not as at a common Meal, but a particular Rite, appointed by *Christ* for a Religious Remembrance of him and his Death†;" the *Doctor* thinks such an Examination *at that Time* not sufficient, and that the Assertion of it is not only *rash* but *absurd*, for that "nothing can cure such Evils as those of an uncharitable

\* Pag. 55.

† Pag. 71. of the *Plain Account*.

charitable Mind, but a *previous, deliberate and strict Examination.*"

Whether a Man may not *becalm* himself at once, as well as *resolve* well at once, will be clear'd as I go along; but at present I shall observe, that their uncharitable Divisions were at least, not the *only* or *principal* Cause of their *Unworthiness* as mention'd by St. Paul, 'tis plain from this: That it was such a Disorder, as hinder'd them from *discerning the Lord's Body*, or rendered them incapable of *distinguishing* the sacred Elements from a common Meal, and, of *duly considering* that they did That Action in Remembrance of *Christ* and his *Death*. But This, a little Quarrelling and Contention about who should sit down and sup *first*, or who among them should have *more* or *less*, could not hinder them from, or render them incapable of, doing: And therefore 'tis most reasonable to believe, that they were so intoxicated with the Excess of their *Feast*, that they neither did nor could do it. And hence that Assertion of the Apostle most rationally follows: *For this cause, many are weak and sickly among you, and many sleep.* For I cannot be of the *Doctor's* Opinion, "That because these Calamities are said to be a *Divine* Judgment upon them, therefore, they were not also the Effects of a *Second Cause*:" For 'tis allowedly the common Method of God's acting in the World, to punish the Vices of Men, by the natural Consequences of

D 2

them.

them. But omitting this: Though I do not see, that the *Author* in any Part of his Book does absolutely confine our Examination to the very Time of attending upon the Sacrament, as the *Doctor* represents it; (for the *Frame* of our Mind, on which he says our Worthiness at that Time depends, is a very different thing from our Examination) yet I would ask, supposing that: Whether such an Examination, how short soever it be, be not previous; and, whether it may not be well-advised, or truly deliberate; though we should allow it to be, not so strict and full and particular, as might be wished? This 'tis certain he cannot deny; except he be able to declare to us, how much Time Previousness and Deliberation will precisely take. And therefore, the condemn'd Assertion is not so rash and absurd, nor consequently so insufficient, as he pretends.

The *Author* indeed does say, " In the  
 " *Public Offices* of our Church, it is observa-  
 " ble, that the Duty of *Examination* is pro-  
 " posed to Those that at that very time stay  
 " there as *Communicants*, and are then call'd  
 " upon to judge and approve themselves,  
 " with the proper Dispositions to the *Lord's*  
 " *Table*. All which must be supposed to be  
 " founded upon this, That even so short an  
 " Examination in the Church itself, just be-  
 " fore partaking of the *Bread* and *Wine*, may  
 " be sufficient \*." This, he says, our  
 Church

\* Pag. 73. of the *Plain Account*.



Church supposes, or, we at least must suppose she does. And can the *Doctor* deny it? No: But he (after *his* way) infers the contrary, from the *Exhortation* of the *Communion-Office*, "which calls upon the *Communicants*, to *repent them truly* of their Sins past, to *have a lively Faith* in Christ our Saviour, to *amend our Lives*, and to *be in Charity* with all Men: All which, he thinks, cannot be done of a sudden, but requires a long preparatory Consideration †."

Now let it be remembered, that the *Author* of the *Plain Account* does not discommend or discountenance an Examination of a Man's whole Life and Conduct upon this Occasion, but only says, "he does not think it essentially Necessary as a Duty then, more than at any other time, (which a Man may discreetly chuse for himself) required of us; and; that Our Church does not require it ||."

Which to Me is such an obvious Truth, that I think I can force the *Doctor* to grant it, or to give his Reason up for ever, notwithstanding his Resolution to the contrary.

He himself, I will charitably suppose, is constantly and habitually prepared for the Administration and Participation of this Holy Sacrament; but he knows, it is not always so with all his Brethren: And yet they are often called out, on this Occasion, to attend the Sick; and it must be done of a sudden,

at

† Pag. 59.

† Pag. 73. of the *Plain Account*.

at most at a *very short* Warning, lest there should not be an Opportunity of doing it. Is then such an *hasty* Examination, as they must then make, *sufficient* or no, for a Man to be satisfied in his own Mind, whether he has a *lively Faith*, is in *Charity* with all Men, and intends to *lead a new Life* for the future? *He*, and every *Clergyman*, must say it is, or lay a most heavy Charge of Guilt upon all the Churches of *G O D*, who strictly enjoin their *Clergy* such Severities. How then can he aver, as he does, with any degree of Truth, "That the *Author* might as well accuse the " Church of *Popery* or *Pelagianism*, or any " thing else that is contrary to sound Do- " ctrine, and as easily prove the same by " Her *Liturgy* and *Articles*, as shew that she " encourages her Members, to take up with " this Notion of the Examination required " by *St. Paul* \*." For does not She lay *this*, even as a *Command* (in some Cases) upon the *Clergy*, both in the *Rubrics* of her *Liturgy*, and in her *Canons* also? And tho' there is generally in Our Church, as he truly observes, a *Week's* Notice given before the Celebration; yet he knows also, this is not *always* so. For, were Notice to be given on a *Sunday* only, (but it may be given on any *Holiday* in the Week as well †) supposing for Instance *Christmas-day*, whereon we have generally a Sacrament throughout *England*, should, as  
it

\* Pag. 56. † See *Rubric* to the first Exhortation.

it sometimes does, fall on a *Monday*, what becomes then of his *Weekly Preparation*? For then the Exhortation must be read, but the Day before. In short, the *Doctor* seems to have thought so little, and reasons so poorly, upon this *Head*, that I cannot but blush for his Indolence or Inobservation. Indeed, by being so stiff in his *Weekly Preparations*, "that he knows not *what Name to give to the contrary Opinion* \*;" one would almost fancy, he is trying to reduce us to the *Rosary*, again, by making the Merit of Religion to consist in saying just so many *Pater Nosters*, *Ave Maria's*, *Kyrie Eleesons*, and such like.

To proceed: The Author of the *Plain Account* having said, *pag.* 76. "That the whole  
 " Affair of eating and drinking *worthily* in St.  
 " *Paul's* Sense, is confined to the Frame of our  
 " Minds, and to our Behaviour, *at the very*  
 " *Time* of our Performance of this religious  
 " Duty;" And again, *Pag.* 77. "Whoever  
 " does it with a *serious* and *Christian* Frame  
 " of Mind, and with a Behaviour *suitable* to  
 " the *Design* of the Institution; partaking of  
 " it, as a *sincere* Disciple of *Christ*, under a  
 " *Sense* of his own *strict* Obligations, as *such*;  
 " cannot possibly be said to eat and drink *un-*  
 " *worthily*:" The Learned *Doctor* very distinguishingly comments upon it, in the following manner. "So that whatever gross  
 " Impieties a Christian may have been guilty  
 " of,

\* *Pag.* 59.

“ of, though he be (that is, is still) a *Blas-*  
 “ *phemer* of God, an *Hinderer* or *Slanderer*  
 “ of his Word, an *Adulterer*, or be in *Ma-*  
 “ *lice*, or *Envy*, or in any other *grievous*  
 “ *Crime*, and comes to that Holy Table *with-*  
 “ *out any Degree* of Repentance or Remorse  
 “ for his Sins; he may, notwithstanding all  
 “ this, partake of the *Lord's Supper*, not on-  
 “ ly *innocently* but *worthily*, if the Frame of  
 “ his Mind be but *serious*, and his Behaviour  
 “ agreeable to the Design of the Institution,  
 “ at the time of his doing so \*.” This is *so*  
*strange* a Misrepresentation of the *Author's*  
 Sense, not to say *so abusive*, that I know not  
 how to account for it: For does he any where  
 say, it must or may be done, *without any De-*  
*gree* of Repentance or Remorse? On the other  
 hand, Does not he expressly say, the *whole Af-*  
*fair* depends on its being done with a *serious*  
*Frame of Mind*, suitable to the Institution?  
 And to what End is the Institution, but for  
 the solemn Remembrance of the Sacrifice of  
 the Death of *Christ*? And can any Man think  
*seriously* of *Christ* dying for the Sins of the  
 whole World, without *some Degree* of Shame,  
 and Sorrow, and Remorse for his own Sins,  
 and Resolution of Amendment? Can he at  
 least, in the *Author's* Sense, do it; who even  
 in this place describes the *serious* Christian *par-*  
*taking* of it, “ as a sincere Disciple of *Christ*,  
 under a Sense of his own *strict* Obligations,  
 as



as such?" For my part, I have no other Notion of a *serious Frame* of Mind but this, *suitable* to the Institution of the *Lord's Supper*; nor can any Man else, I am sure, invent another, without mistaking a *serious Mind* for a *grave, solemn, hypocritical Face*. And therefore I cannot but conclude, since Dr. Warren condemns it to so high a Degree, it is under this *false Idea*; which he has not thought deliberately enough on, to distinguish it from the *true one*. How else could he imagine, a Man may come *seriously* to the *Sacrament*; without any Degree of Repentance whatsoever? A *serious and Christian Frame* of Mind (as the *Author* himself expresses it) implies not only *Earnestness* of Attention, but *Sincerity* of Heart, and such it must be, if it be supposed *suitable* to the *Sacred Institution*.

But here I'll beg Leave to put the *Doctor* in mind, that in the very last Words of his *first Part*, he himself has said much more than the *Author* does; but indeed *much more inconsistently*, and (as I shew'd in my Remarks upon it) on *much slighter Grounds*. The *Author* maintains here, "that if a Man's Frame of Mind and external Behaviour be *suitable* to the Institution, at his partaking of the *Lord's Supper*, he is a *Worthy Receiver*:" But the *Doctor* avers there, "that all *serious and devout* Christians, who *duly* partake of the *Lord's Supper*, are admitted to a Share in the Expiations and Benefits of *Christ's Death*." There

is no Difference that I know of, between a *Serious and Devout Christian duly partaking*; and, a Christian whose Frame of Mind and Behaviour is *serious and suitable* to the *Design* of the Institution: And yet the one, says Dr. *Warren*, is *actually admitted* to the Benefits of *Christ's Death*; but the other, is an *unworthy Guest* at the *Lord's Table*. Was ever any thing more inconsistent, or so contradictory? There can be no Reason for this, but because the *Author* recommends the one, and *He* the other.

However, 'tis pretended to be; because the *Author* has said, "the *whole Affair* of eating and drinking *worthily, or unworthily*, is confin'd to the Frame of our Minds *at that time*;" and therefore he goes on to raise an Outcry against him, "That this is both "*monstrous* in itself, and *contrary* not only to the Doctrine of our *own Church*, "but of all *other Churches* in the *Christian World* \*." Whereas, This is either the *Truth* of the *whole Affair*, or there can be *no Truth* belonging to it. For, suppose a Man has *pray'd*, and *repented*, and *examined himself* as thoroughly as the *Doctor* would have him; and yet when he comes to the *Sacrament* should *change* his Mind, (as is not impossible) and act *unsuitably* to the Institution: Would he pronounce such an one a *Worthy Receiver*? No, certainly. But for what

what Reason? Why, because the Frame of his Mind and Behaviour were not so *serious* and *becoming*, as the Nature and Design of the *Institution* required they should be at *that* Solemnity. On the other hand then, suppose a Man has *sinn'd*, and *blasphemed*, and been guilty of many *grievous Crimes*, and of a sudden *changes* his Mind without any *preparatory* Examination, even just when he sees others going up to the *Holy Table*, (as is possible, if we call to mind how *sudden*, and yet how *effectual*, the Repentance was of the Thief on the Cross; which was certainly done without a *Miracle*, or it had not been rewarded) and goes himself directly to the *Sacrament*, and behaves in a *serious* and *becoming* manner: Would he pronounce him an *Unworthy Receiver*? To be sure, he would not: Or all Men of Sense would condemn him, if he did. But for what Reason? Why, because the Frame of his Mind and his Behaviour were at *that very time* suitable to the Design of the *Institution*. The Conclusion therefore is *just*, That the whole Merit of a Man's Acceptance, thro' *Christ*, will, and must necessarily, at the Sacrament of the *Lord's Supper*, depend on the Frame of his Mind at *that time*, and no other. To which purpose the *Author* himself, *pag. 83. of the Plain Account*: "If a Man, *says he*, performs this particular Religious Duty, in a Manner and with a Temper and Behaviour *suitable*

“ to the Nature and Design of it, that is,  
 “ with a *serious Remembrance* of *Christ* as his  
 “ Lord and Master, who claims, and has a  
 “ Right to, his Obedience; — it will not  
 “ follow from his past Failures in *other*  
 “ Points of Duty, that he partakes of the  
 “ Lord’s Supper *unworthily*, in *St. Paul’s*  
 “ Sense: For if this were the Case, no one  
 “ who had been a *wilful Sinner* could ever  
 “ partake *worthily* of this holy Rite.” Which  
 Words leave the *Author’s* Doctrine so *plain*,  
 and his Meaning so *irreprehensible*, that I shall  
 with Them leave the *Doctor* to himself, with-  
 out pursuing him any farther; that he may  
*seriously* and *christianly* look back upon the  
 Merit of his Performance, and see if he can  
 do it, *without any degree of Repentance* what-  
 soever.

Only I shall make this *one* general Reflec-  
 tion: That it is not the *Author’s Book*, as  
 the Clamor is, but the Weakness and Envy  
 of the *pretended Answers* given to it, which  
 will do Disservice to Religion, and encourage  
 Infidelity. But as I’m only concern’d with  
 Dr. *Warren*, I shall confine my Observations  
 to Him only. He himself mistakes the Be-  
 nefits of *Christ’s Passion*, for the Spiritual Be-  
 nefits of the *Lord’s Supper*; and because the  
*Author* denies, that the *former* are given or  
 convey’d to us by this Religious Duty, he  
 therefore concludes he denies the *latter* are  
 also: Hence he inconsiderately takes it for  
 granted,



granted, that the *Author* endeavours to prove the Lord's Supper to be *no Sacrament*, or *no Means of Grace*, nor any Pledge to assure us thereof; because he does not, like the *Doctor*, take the actual *Pardon of our Sins for Grace*, and our actual *Admission into Heaven* for our bare *Title* to it \*. Again he mistakes the Examination of that *Frame of Mind*, which the *Author* says our Worthiness depends on at the Sacrament for *all* the Examination that he allows of; and sticks not to affirm, that according to *Him* a Man may come to it without *any* Examination at all; when the Examination of a Man's Self at *that* time, whether he has *that Frame of Mind*, is a plain Bar to his coming at all, if he has it not. Nay, he thinks himself, (according to *his* Way of Arguing †) that a Man may come to the Sacrament with *such a serious Frame of Mind* as is *suitable* to the Institution of the *Lord's Supper*, with a thousand *unrepented* Sins about him; when, according to the *Author*, that *very Frame of Mind* excludes them all. These Blunders of his *own* he charges upon the *Author*, and propagates these *vile* Notions in *His* Name, contrary to the *plain* Design and *express* Doctrine of his *Book*. At this rate *any* Author may be abused, and the *best* of Men defamed, and made odious to the *un-enquiring* World. To expose this *malignant* Spirit,

\* See Pag. 29, 30. of my former Remarks.

† Pag. 62.

Spirit, and indeed to turn such *sophistical* Reasonings into Ridicule, has been the *chief* Intent of *these* Remarks: Not purely to defend the *Author*, or his *Book*, which are both *irreproachable*, and want *no Defence*. They, I dare say, will continue Valuable and Venerable in the Judgment of all truly Learned and Religious Men; when every Libel against them is sunk into the *Gulph of human Possessions* \*, and the Writers of them gone into the *Land where all things are forgotten*.

- \* See *Swift's Miscellanies*.

5 0059

